

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2 and 4 through 19 remain in this application in which claims 10 through 19 are withdrawn. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has been amended.

Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for the detailed explanation and illustrative drawings provide by the above Office Action. Applicants' representative now has a better understanding of the Examiner's arguments against allowance of the pending claims.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 through 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,816,713 to Chen ("Chen patent").

Independent claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a latch comprising a thumb release coupled to the clasp arm, in which the clasp arm deforms in response to receiving a force at the thumb release, thereby decoupling the clasp from the electronic device. Support for the above added recitation of claim 1 is provided at page 5, lines 1 through 4, and page 8, lines 17 through 20, of the specification.

In contrast, the Chen patent discloses a holding arm 35 having a vertical holding board 351 at one end of, and perpendicular to, an arm embodiment 352. The Chen patent does not include a thumb release but, as shown in FIG. 3, there is a little bit of room for a user's thumb at the tip of the vertical holding board 351 to allow a user to push the arm embodiment 352 out of a spring receiving room 241 of a retaining mount 20. Even so, the Chen patent does not describe

or suggest a clasp arm deforms in response to receiving a force at a thumb release of a latch, as required by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 as amended distinguishes patentably from the Chen patent.

Claims 2 and 4 through 9 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1 as amended. Therefore, claims 2 and 4 through 9 distinguish patentably from the Chen patent for the reasons stated above for amended claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 through 9 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Phelps, William C., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>09/26/06</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	